



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,464	02/22/2005	Wim Helsen	GN02028	9187
<div>7590 07/17/2007</div> <div>Robert A Sabourin Agfa Corporation Patent Department 200 Ballardvale Street Wilmington, MA 01069</div> <div>EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L</div> <div>ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>2174</div> <div>MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>07/17/2007 PAPER</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/505,464	Applicant(s) HELSEN, WIM	
	Examiner sherrod keaton	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-22-2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-20-2004</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of February 22, 2005. Claims 1-18 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Regarding Claim 11, it is rejected because it is directed towards a computer program and therefore does not fall within at least one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-13, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Sanderson (US 2002/0101448 A1).

Claims 1 and 13: Sanderson discloses a method for adjusting a user interface for processing a job in a pre-press workflow system, the method comprising checking a job type of said job (Column 2, Paragraph 14-15, and 23); and automatically adjusting said user interface depending on said job type (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claims 3 and 16: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 and 13 above, and further discloses comprising the step of: automatically adjusting a layout of said user interface depending on said job type (Column 2, Paragraph 14, 15 and 23).

Claims 4 and 17: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 and 13 above, and further discloses comprising the step of: automatically adjusting an appropriate terminology for said job type in said user interface (Column 2, Paragraph 14, 15 and 23). Taking context information to configure an appropriate terminology to that job instance.

Claim 5: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: setting a parameter for said job type; and displaying specific data in said user interface depending on said parameter (Column 2, Paragraph 14 and 15; Column 5, Paragraph 53).

Claim 6: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: receiving input data for said job; checking an origin of said input data; and determining said job type based on said origin (Column 1, Paragraph 13).

Claim 7: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: checking a characteristic of data related to said job; and determining said job type based on said characteristic (Column 2, Paragraph 14 and 15).

Claim 8: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: determining said job type by a user; and storing said determined job type wherein said storing step precedes said step of checking said job type (Column 4, Paragraph 38).

Claim 9: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: creating a new job type; and defining a new user interface by a user for processing jobs of said new job type in said pre-press workflow system (Column 4, Paragraph 40-42). Takes input from user and can reconfigure view and controller components on behalf of user.

Claim 10: Sanderson discloses a data processing system comprising means for carrying out the steps of the method as in claim 1 above (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 11: Sanderson discloses a computer program comprising computer program code means adapted to perform the steps of the method as in claim 1 above when said program is run on a computer (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 12: Sanderson discloses a computer readable medium comprising program code adapted to carry out the method as in claim 1 above when run on a computer (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 18: Sanderson discloses a computer program product as in claim 17 above and further comprising: fifth program instruction for receiving input data for said job; sixth program instructions for checking an origin of said input data; and seventh program instructions for determining said job type based on said origin (Column 4, Paragraph 40-42). Input is received, they are translated to service request and are registered with the change propagation mechanism and the data can be taken and perform procedures of the interface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kremer et al. (7003723 B1) in view of Sanderson (US 20020101448 A1).

Claims 2 and 14: Kremer discloses a method of a job type being in the commercial printing industry or the packaging printing industry (Column 2, Line 57- Column 3, Line 9). But does not explicitly disclose wherein step of checking a job type and automatically adjusting the user interface depending on that job. However Sanderson discloses generating a declarative user interface and further discloses adjusting the user interface based on the workflow (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the workflow process related to the printing industry and have an adjustable user interface for Kremer as taught by Sanderson. One would have been motivated to have an adjustable user interface for the printing industry because the many aspects of the print job can be complicated and a user interface specific to print workflow process improves efficiency of the job.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

6-25-07

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

3. Claims 1, 3-13, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sanderson (US 2002/0101448 A1).

Claims 1 and 13: Sanderson discloses a method for adjusting a user interface for processing a job in a pre-press workflow system, the method comprising checking a job type of said job (Column 2, Paragraph 14-15, and 23); and automatically adjusting said user interface depending on said job type (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claims 3 and 16: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 and 13 above, and further discloses comprising the step of: automatically adjusting a layout of said user interface depending on said job type (Column 2, Paragraph 14, 15 and 23).

Claims 4 and 17: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 and 13 above, and further discloses comprising the step of: automatically adjusting an appropriate terminology for said job type in said user interface (Column 2, Paragraph 14, 15 and 23). Taking context information to configure an appropriate terminology to that job instance.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of February 22, 2005. Claims 1-18 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Regarding Claim 11, it is rejected because it is directed towards a computer program and therefore does not fall within at least one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 5: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: setting a parameter for said job type; and displaying specific data in said user interface depending on said parameter (Column 2, Paragraph 14 and 15; Column 5, Paragraph 53).

Claim 6: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: receiving input data for said job; checking an origin of said input data; and determining said job type based on said origin (Column 1, Paragraph 13).

Claim 7: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: checking a characteristic of data related to said job; and determining said job type based on said characteristic (Column 2, Paragraph 14 and 15).

Claim 8: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: determining said job type by a user; and storing said determined job type wherein said storing step precedes said step of checking said job type (Column 4, Paragraph 38).

Claim 9: Sanderson discloses a method as in Claims 1 above, and further discloses comprising the steps of: creating a new job type; and defining a new user interface by a

user for processing jobs of said new job type in said pre-press workflow system (Column 4, Paragraph 40-42). Takes input from user and can reconfigure view and controller components on behalf of user.

Claim 10: Sanderson discloses a data processing system comprising means for carrying out the steps of the method as in claim 1 above (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 11: Sanderson discloses a computer program comprising computer program code means adapted to perform the steps of the method as in claim 1 above when said program is run on a computer (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 12: Sanderson discloses a computer readable medium comprising program code adapted to carry out the method as in claim 1 above when run on a computer (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Claim 18: Sanderson discloses a computer program product as in claim 17 above and further comprising: fifth program instruction for receiving input data for said job; sixth program instructions for checking an origin of said input data; and seventh program instructions for determining said job type based on said origin (Column 4, Paragraph 40-42). Input is received, they are translated to service request and are registered with the change propagation mechanism and the data can be taken and perform procedures of the interface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kremer et al. (7003723 B1) in view of Sanderson (US 20020101448 A1).

Claims 2 and 14: Kremer discloses a method of a job type being in the commercial printing industry or the packaging printing industry (Column 2, Line 57- Column 3, Line 9). But does not explicitly disclose wherein step of checking a job type and automatically adjusting the user interface depending on that job. However Sanderson discloses generating a declarative user interface and further discloses adjusting the user interface based on the workflow (Column 2, Paragraph 23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the workflow process related to the printing industry and have an adjustable user interface for Kremer as taught by Sanderson. One would have been motivated to have an adjustable user interface for the printing industry because the many aspects of the print job can be complicated and a user interface specific to print workflow process improves efficiency of the job.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/505,464

Page 8

Art Unit: 2174

SLK

6-25-07